Learners' Engagement with Teacher Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) in EFL Context: Associations with Writing Ability

Indyra Mahdiana[1], Yudhi Arifani[2], Slamet Asari[3]
[1,2,3] *Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik. East Java, Indonesia*
indyramahdii@gmail.com, yudhi_arif@umg.ac.id, asari70@umg.ac.id

Abstract

Learners' engagement with written corrective feedback as main part which connects between provision of written corrective feedback and writing outcomes. In other words, the level of learners' engagement with written corrective feedback will determine learners' writing ability. This current study completes the existing literatures by examining relationship between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability. The correlation design was implemented in this research among 88 participants which divided into three classes. Learners were asked to do writing task and revise it based on teacher WCF which they receive. Then, learners also need to fill nine items of learners' engagement with teacher WCF questionnaire. The results of this research showed that there was very strong positive correlation between learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' writing ability with the value of pearson correlation was 0.824 and sig. tailed was 0.000 < 0,05. It indicated that the correlation between learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' writing ability was important and real. So, learners' engagement with teacher WCF could be used as one of predictor factors of writing ability.

I. Introduction

Corrective feedback (CF) that refers to responses of learners' utterances which indicate an error both in implicitly or explicitly (Ellis et al., 2006; Nassaji, 2018) has been debatable and controversial issue in second language learning during past few decades (Bitchener et al., 2005; Schenck, 2020; Tang & Liu, 2018; Y. Zhang et al., 2010). It was bringing up to pro and contra issue, since some researchers assert that corrective feedback is effective (Bitchener et al., 2005; Chen & Liu, 2021; Ellis et al., 2006; D. Ferris, 1999; Karim & Nassaji, 2018; Li, 2010; Sheen, 2010; Yousefi & Nassaji, 2021), while others state that corrective feedback is ineffective and harmful (Truscott, 1999). Moreover, written corrective feedback (WCF) is defined as some responses related to learners' linguistic errors in written and used by teachers to help learners for improving their writing's accuracy (Li & Roshan, 2019; Mao & Lee, 2020). The learning is aimed at reconstructing students who are looking for information and finding out knowledge that is able to solve problems, cooperate, and tolerate diversity. If the desire is successful in a satisfying way, it will increase students' self-confidence as well as a high sense of responsibility and civilized humans who can identify themselves with stable, independent personalities and have emotional stability with intellectual knowledge. (Pradana, D. et al. 2020)

27352

Spending a lot of time in providing written corrective feedback by responding to some errors on learners writing work (e.g., Kim et al., 2020; Lee, 2019), most of writing teachers may be expecting that their learners have a deeply engaged with that feedback. However, their expectation is not always fulfilled (e.g., Ferris et al., 2013; Lee, 2008). Thus, to help teachers enhance the effect of their written corrective feedback on learners writing ability, teacher needs to understand regarding learners' engagement with written corrective feedback (Asari & Maruf, 2022). It is because learner engagement is a main link which connects between the provision of written corrective feedback and the learning outcomes (Han & Hyland, 2015). Learner engagement with feedback can be defined as responses of learners toward feedback that they received (Ellis, 2010). A good learning media is the one which can adapt various student learning styles in order to achieve the learning goals – one of them is digital flipbook. It is an electronic learning media in which text, audio and visuals are included. Flipbook is one of the classic animations made by a piece of paper, mostly found in the form of 'thick' book, and each paper aims to describe something – its appearance is designed in some specific ways so that the within objects may move or pop-up when opened (Nafiah in Afwan, B. et al, 2020).

Studies on learners' engagement with corrective feedback have been done by several researchers. Most of them focused on exploring how was learners' engagement with some types of written corrective feedback (Fan & Xu, 2020; Koltovskaia, 2020; Uscinski, 2017; Zhang & Hyland, 2018; Zheng & Yu, 2018) and factors affecting learners' engagement (Han, 2017; Han & Xu, 2019; Tsao, 2021; Tsao et al., 2021). Furthermore, research also has shown the effectiveness of written corrective feedback on learners' writing depends on learners' engagement (Tsao et al., 2021). Learners' engagement with written corrective feedback as main part which connects between provision of written corrective feedback and writing outcomes. In other words, the level of learners' engagement with written corrective feedback will determine learners' writing ability. However, there was little research concerning relationship between learners' engagement with written corrective feedback and writing ability. Thus, this current study completes the existing literatures by examining relationship between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

II. Review of Literature

Previous studies had shown that learners' engagement with written corrective feedback consists of three dimensions of engagement (i.e., cognitive engagement, behaviour engagement and affective engagement) as stated by (Ellis, 2010). Behavioral engagement focused on learners' involvement in their tasks and activities, cognitive engagement focused on learners' understanding related some ideas, knowledge and information and affective engagement focused on learners' emotional responses during learning process (Fredricks et al., 2004, 2005; Zheng et al., 2019; Zheng & Yu, 2018). Thus, some of researches have focused on exploring three dimensions or spesific dimensions (one or two different dimensions) of learners' engagement with written corrective feedback (Fan & Xu, 2020; Koltovskaia, 2020; Tsao et al., 2021; Zhang & Hyland, 2018; Zheng & Yu, 2018). Then, (Svalberg, 2009) had add one more dimension of the three-component construct of learners' engagement, that is, social engagement, which can be defined as becoming interactive and initiating engagement in langauge teaching and learning process (Asari & Maruf, 2022).

Moreover, (Tsao et al., 2021) also combine two dimensions engagement (cognitive, behaviour) of (Ellis, 2010) with social engagement of (Svalberg, 2009) and associate with motivation and writing performance. However, (Tsao et al., 2021) did not examine affective engagement to avoid overlap with the two motivational constructs (intrinsic and extrinsic) which operationalized in their study. So, they only focused on three dimensions of learner's engagement with written corrective feedback (cognitive, behaviour and social engagement). Thus, by completing this, the current study aimed to use four dimensions of learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback (cognitive, behaviour, affective and social engagement) and correlate it with learners' writing ability.

III. Research Method

This research used correlation design to examine whether there was significant correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and writing ability.

The participants of this study were students of senior high school at 11th grade in MA. Masyhudiyah Giri who were divided into three classes, namely; XI Science 1 (29 students), XI Science 2 (26 students) and XI Social (33 students). Each class had different number of students. So, the total of participants based on the Table 3.1 above were 88 learners. The age of learners were 16-17 years old. These learners have already joined English subject in the first semester at 11th grade. So, now they were joining English subject on the beginning of second semester at 11th grade. The participants had an average ability level in English, especially for writing. It was seen from the English teaching and learning process, including writing on the previous semester. In this research used learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback questionnaire and writing test as the instruments. Learners' engagement with written corrective feedback questionnaire which used in this study was adapted from (Tsao et al., 2021) and (Fan & Xu, 2020). So, total items of learners' engagement questionnaire were nine items and covered four dimensions learners' engagement (i.e., behavior, cognitive, social and affective engagement). Moreover, the *Cronbach's Alpha* of this questionnaire was 0.742. It means that all items of learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback questionnaire were valid and reliable. The answer of each questionnaire item was given a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, neutral=3, agree=4, strongly agree=5). However, the writing test which conducted in this study related to personal letter topic. Learners' writing test would be corrected by using teacher written corrective feedback. In this test, the learners were asked to write a composition related to personal letter text

IV. Result and Discussion

This research examined the correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability on eleventh grade. The result detail of the correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability using *Pearson Product Moment* could be seen in the table below:

Table 1. The Correlation Between Learners' Engagement with Teacher Written Corrective Feedback And Learners' Writing Ability On Eleventh Grade

		Engagement with Teacher WCF	Writing Revision Score of Teacher WCF
Engagement with Teacher WCF	Pearson Correlation	1	.824**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	88	88
Writing Revision Score of Teacher WCF	Pearson Correlation	.824**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	88	88

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on table 1, it was showed that the p-value (significant value) of learners' engagement with teacher WCF and writing ability (revision of teacher WCF) was 0.000. This was lower than the p-value (0.05). By considering this, the null hypothesis (H0) could be rejected since the p-value of this correlation was lower than 0.05. Because the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected, then the working hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. So, it meant that, there was significant correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

Moreover, based on table 4.1 also showed that the coefficient correlation between learners' engagement with teacher WCF and writing ability (revision of teacher WCF) was 0.824. Here, based on (Muijs, 2004), 0.824 was belonged to very strong correlation. Then, from table 4.1 also could be seen that the cooficient correlation showed the positive value. It meant that there was very strong positive correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

In addition, positive value here could be understood that learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' writing ability were in the same direction. It indicated that if learners' engagement with teacher WCF was high, so their writing ability was also high. Therefore, learners who had high engagement with teacher WCF were more likely to show higher writing ability. It also implied that learners need to enhance their engagement with teacher WCF to increase their writing ability. Meanwhile, for very strong correlation which existed between learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' writing ability could be indicated that learners' engagement with teacher WCF could be used as one of very strong or best predictors of learners' writing ability. It meant that the level of learners' engagement with teacher WCF might give very strong influence to learners' writing ability. So, the correlation between learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' ability was positive and very strongly correlated.

The result correlation of this study was consistent with (Fredricks et al., 2004) which stated that learners' engagement was generally believed had positive correlation with academic achievement and also had great potential to increase learners' outcomes. This was also supported by study of (Tsao et al., 2021) which examined inner causal relationships between motivation, learner engagement with written corrective feedback and writing performance. The results showed that both intrinsic motivation and learner

engagement with written corrective feedback could effect directly on learners' writing scores. Moreover, learners' engagement with written corrective feedback also became more powerful predictor of writing performance rather than intrinsic motivation. Next, the difference between this research and previous research conducted by (Tsao et al., 2021) was that this research used four dimensions of learners' engagement (behavior, cognitive, affective and social), while previous research only focused on three dimensions (behavior, cognitive and social). So, this research had added and completed the previous research.

V. Conclusion

There was very strong positive correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability. It could be seen from the value of pearson correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and writing ability was 0.824 (very strong correlation) and sig. tailed was 0.000 < 0,05 (significant correlation). It meant that the correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability is important and real. So, learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback could be used as one of predictor factors of writing ability.

References

Afwan, B. et al. (2020). The Development of Digital Flipbook Media Based on the 5 Hours Battle of Kalianda upon High School History Materials. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal). P. 1003-1012.

Asari, S., & Maruf, N. (2022). Organizational Method of EFL Undergraduate Students' Academic Essay Writing with and Without Pre-Determined Topic. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences, 5(3).

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 14(3), 191–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Chen, W., & Liu, G. Q. (2021). Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback: Teachers' Perspectives. Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 9(1), 23–42. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2021.120974

Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 335–349. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990544

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND THE ACQUISITION OF L2 GRAMMAR. 339–368.

Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 50(December 2019), 100775. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to truscott (1996). Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6

Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. Journal of Second Language Writing, 22(3), 307–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.009

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement Potential of

The Concept. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59–109.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P., Friedel, J., & Paris, A. (2005). School Engagement. In What Do Children Need to Flourish? (Vol. 545, pp. 305–321). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-23823-9_19

Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and being mediated: Learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. System, 69, 133–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.07.003

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. Journal of Second Language Writing, 30, 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002

Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2019). Student feedback literacy and engagement with feedback: a case study of Chinese undergraduate students. Teaching in Higher Education, 26(2), 181–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1648410

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2018). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. Language Teaching Research, 24(4), 519–539. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469

Kim, Y. J., Choi, B., Kang, S., Kim, B., & Yun, H. (2020). Comparing the effects of direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback: Learning outcomes and students' perceptions. Foreign Language Annals, 53(1), 176–199. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12443

Koltovskaia, S. (2020). Student engagement with automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) provided by Grammarly: A multiple case study. Assessing Writing, 44(February), 100450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100450

Lee, I. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. Journal of Second Language Writing, 17(3), 144–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.12.001

Lee, I. (2019). Teacher written corrective feedback: Less is more. Language Teaching, 52(4), 524–536. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247

Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. Language Learning, 60(2), 309–365. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Li, S., & Roshan, S. (2019). The associations between working memory and the effects of four different types of written corrective feedback. Journal of Second Language Writing, 45(September 2018), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.03.003

Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2020). Feedback scope in written corrective feedback: Analysis of empirical research in L2 contexts. Assessing Writing, 45(February), 100469. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100469

Muijs, D. (2004). Doing Quantitative research in Education. SAGE.

Nassaji, H. (2018). Corrective Feedback. The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.EELT0050

Pradana, D. et al. (2020). Nasionalism: Character Education Orientation in Learning Development. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal).P. 4026-4034

Schenck, A. (2020). Using meta-analysis of technique and timing to optimize corrective feedback for specific grammatical features. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00097-9

Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. In Studies in Second Language Acquisition (Vol. 32, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990507

Svalberg, A. M. L. (2009). Engagement with language: Interrogating a construct. Language Awareness, 18(3–4), 242–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410903197264

Tang, C., & Liu, Y. T. (2018). Effects of indirect coded corrective feedback with and without short affective teacher comments on L2 writing performance, learner uptake and motivation. Assessing Writing, 35(January 2017), 26–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2017.12.002

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes": A response to Ferris. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(2), 111–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80124-6

Tsao, J. J. (2021). Effects of EFL Learners' L2 Writing Self-efficacy on Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback. Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 30(6), 575–584. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00591-9

Tsao, J. J., Tseng, W. T., Hsiao, T. Y., Wang, C., & Gao, A. X. (2021). Toward a Motivation-Regulated Learner Engagement WCF Model of L2 Writing Performance. SAGE Open, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211023172

Uscinski, I. (2017). L2 Learners' Engagement with Direct Written Corrective Feedback in First-Year Composition Courses. Journal of Response to Writing, 3(2), 36–62. www.journalRW.org

Yousefi, M., & Nassaji, H. (2021). Corrective feedback in second language pragmatics: A review of research. Tesl-Ej, 25(1), 1–14.

Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., & Ma, L. (2010). A Brief Analysis of Corrective Feedback in Oral Interaction. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1(3), 306–308. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.306-308

Zhang, Z. (Victor), & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. Assessing Writing, 36(February), 90–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004

Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. Assessing Writing, 37(January), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001

Zheng, Y., Yu, S., Wang, B., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Exploring student engagement with supervisor feedback on master's thesis: Insights from a case study. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 57(2), 186–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1617181